

97-84053-21

Dale, Samuel Sherman

Misrepresentation and  
fraud in the sale of goods

Boston

[1914?]

97-84053-21  
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES  
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308  
Z Dale, Samuel Sherman, 1859-1935  
Box 108 Misrepresentation and fraud in the sale of  
goods; a statement by Samuel S. Dale before the  
Committee on federal relations of the Massachu-  
setts legislature on the resolution calling on  
Congress to pass the Lindquist bill, March, 1914  
... ~~1914~~ Boston [1914?]  
24 p. illus. 16 $\frac{1}{2}$  cm.  
  
Reprinted from the Textile world record.  
  
omitted

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm

REDUCTION RATIO: 9:1

IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA IIA IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 3-26-97

INITIALS: MS

TRACKING # : 22859

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

# Misrepresentation and Fraud in the Sale of Goods

A STATEMENT

by

SAMUEL S. DALE

before the Committee on Federal Relations of the Massachusetts Legislature on the Resolution Calling on Congress to Pass the Lindquist Bill

MARCH, 1914


Reprinted from the Textile World Record  
Boston, Mass.

Concord

308

Z

Box 108



12. Wool Challie, \$5.05 per lb. (top); 13. Cotton Crepe, \$7.38 per lb (center); 14. Low Grade Cotton Duck, 23½ cents per lb. (bottom). The Cotton Crepe is more expensive than the Wool Challie. Both the Cotton Crepe (\$5.05 per lb.) and the Cotton Duck (23½ cents per lb.) would bear the same label, "pure cotton," under the Lindquist bill.

JAN 4 1914


## Misrepresentation and Fraud in the Sale of Goods

Boston, Mass., Feb. 18, 1914.

The proposed resolution (House No. 1937) requests Congress to pass the Lindquist bill providing for the labeling of certain textiles, boots, shoes and rubber goods to indicate the proportions and quality of the materials of which they are composed. The resolution states that the bill will effect a saving in the cost of such goods to the people of the United States, and thus contribute to a reduction in the high cost of living. I propose to show that the Lindquist bill will do nothing of the kind; that, so far as textiles are concerned, it is impossible of enforcement; and that, even if it could be administered, it could not affect directly the retail or wholesale trading with a State, and would lead to the most absurd results in interstate commerce, confusing instead of enlightening the buyers of goods and causing an increase in the opportunity for fraud and misrepresentation.

After demonstrating the futility and absurdity of the Lindquist bill, I will point out an effective remedy for the misrepresentation and fraud practiced in the sale of goods, and will outline a method of procedure by which that remedy can be applied to sales of all kinds of merchandise, within each State, as well as between the States.

## INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE



12. Wool Challie, \$5.05 per lb. (top); 13. Cotton Crepe, \$7.38 per lb (center); 14. Low Grade Cotton Duck, 23½ cents per lb. (bottom). The Cotton Crepe is more expensive than the Wool Challie. Both the Cotton Crepe (\$5.05 per lb.) and the Cotton Duck (23½ cents per lb.) would bear the same label, "pure cotton," under the Lindquist bill.

### Misrepresentation and Fraud in the Sale of Goods


Boston, Mass., Feb. 18, 1914.

The proposed resolution (House No. 1937) requests Congress to pass the Lindquist bill providing for the labeling of certain textiles, boots, shoes and rubber goods to indicate the proportions and quality of the materials of which they are composed. The resolution states that the bill will effect a saving in the cost of such goods to the people of the United States, and thus contribute to a reduction in the high cost of living. I propose to show that the Lindquist bill will do nothing of the kind; that, so far as textiles are concerned, it is impossible of enforcement; and that, even if it could be administered, it could not affect directly the retail or wholesale trading with a State, and would lead to the most absurd results in interstate commerce, confusing instead of enlightening the buyers of goods and causing an increase in the opportunity for fraud and misrepresentation.

After demonstrating the futility and absurdity of the Lindquist bill, I will point out an effective remedy for the misrepresentation and fraud practiced in the sale of goods, and will outline a method of procedure by which that remedy can be applied to sales of all kinds of merchandise, within each State, as well as between the States.

## WOOL AND SHODDY

In presenting facts that demonstrate the claims regarding this bill, let us begin with wool goods. The bill divides wool materials into "pure wool" which is defined as "sheep's



1. Flocks or Wool Dust, 1 1/4 cents per lb. (at left);  
2. Fine Worsted Roving Waste, 57 cents per lb.  
(at right). Both would bear the same Lindquist  
label when made into cloth.

wool which has not been previously used in the manufacture of any other article or fabric", and "shoddy" which is defined as "a wool fiber which has previously passed through the process of manufacture". The

bill is so loosely drawn that it is doubtful how it is intended to classify many by-products of wool, whether as Lindquist "pure wool" or Lindquist "shoddy". If, for example, "shoddy" is only such material as has passed through all of the processes of manufacture, then flocks like this sample (No. 1), which sells for 1 1/4 cents per pound and is wool ground to powder, mere dust, is Lindquist "pure wool". On the other hand, if "pure wool" is only such wool material as has not passed through any of the processes of manufacture, then worsted roving waste like this sample (No. 2), which is fine, high grade, long staple material, selling for 57 cents a pound, is Lindquist "shoddy". Thus either construction of the bill leads to equally absurd conclusions.


Let us consider the bill on the basis of the last supposition. Wool and shoddy have the same physical and chemical structure. The only difference is that shoddy is shorter and sometimes has a less number of projecting scales on the surface of the fiber than has the original wool from which it was derived. There are, however, grades of shoddy which have longer fibers and more numerous scales than are found in many grades of wool; in such cases the material known as shoddy is the more valuable for the manufacture of cloth. Here for example is a rag shoddy (No. 3), now selling in Boston at 34 cents a pound, which, as you will readily see, is better material than this sample (No. 4), of shearlings wool, which sells for 27 cents.

## INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

4

### WOOL AND SHODDY

In presenting facts that demonstrate the claims regarding this bill, let us begin with wool goods. The bill divides wool materials into "pure wool" which is defined as "sheep's



1. Flocks or Wool Dust, 1 1/4 cents per lb. (at left);  
2. Fine Worsted Roving Waste, 57 cents per lb.  
(at right). Both would bear the same Lindquist  
label when made into cloth.

wool which has not been previously used in the manufacture of any other article or fabric", and "shoddy" which is defined as "a wool fiber which has previously passed through the process of manufacture". The

5

bill is so loosely drawn that it is doubtful how it is intended to classify many by-products of wool, whether as Lindquist "pure wool" or Lindquist "shoddy". If, for example, "shoddy" is only such material as has passed through all of the processes of manufacture, then flocks like this sample (No. 1), which sells for 1 1/4 cents per pound and is wool ground to powder, mere dust, is Lindquist "pure wool". On the other hand, if "pure wool" is only such wool material as has not passed through any of the processes of manufacture, then worsted roving waste like this sample (No. 2), which is fine, high grade, long staple material, selling for 57 cents a pound, is Lindquist "shoddy". Thus either construction of the bill leads to equally absurd conclusions.

Let us consider the bill on the basis of the last supposition. Wool and shoddy have the same physical and chemical structure. The only difference is that shoddy is shorter and sometimes has a less number of projecting scales on the surface of the fiber than has the original wool from which it was derived. There are, however, grades of shoddy which have longer fibers and more numerous scales than are found in many grades of wool; in such cases the material known as shoddy is the more valuable for the manufacture of cloth. Here for example is a rag shoddy (No. 3), now selling in Boston at 34 cents a pound, which, as you will readily see, is better material than this sample (No. 4), of shearlings wool, which sells for 27 cents.

And yet under the Lindquist bill, goods containing any of the better stock would be branded as "shoddy", while goods made of the inferior material would be labeled "pure wool".

An even more striking illustration of this Lindquist absurdity is found in the case of what is known as "wool clips", of which this is a sample (No. 5), selling at 1 1/2 cents a pound. These clips consist of about 5 per cent. of very inferior wool imbedded in 95 per cent. of sheep dung. The filthy mass has never "been used in the manufacture of a fabric", and consequently when manufactured into goods the product can be labeled "pure wool" under this Lindquist bill, while goods made of superior stock like the sample just shown you (No. 3, 34 cents), or of worsted roving waste like sample (No. 2, 57 cents), or of this excellent material known as garnetted worsted waste (No. 6), which is sold at 33 cents a pound, must under this absurd bill be labeled "shoddy". Illustrations on this point could be multiplied indefinitely, but they would be merely cumulative.

#### THE LINDQUIST BILL IS UNWORKABLE

What has been said thus far is based on the assumption that the Lindquist bill is workable and that "pure wool" and "shoddy" as defined by the bill can be distinguished by suitable tests when mixed in a fabric. I propose now to show you that this assumption is entirely unwarranted and that so far as wool goods are concerned the Lindquist bill,

which would be ridiculous if it could be enforced, reaches the height of absurdity by being wholly unworkable. If violations of a law cannot be detected the law is a dead letter. It requires no expert knowledge of wool fibers or wool manufacturing, all that is necessary is ordinary intelligence, to understand that Lindquist "shoddy", or wool that "has been previously passed through the process of manufacture", and Lindquist "pure wool" or wool that "has not been previously used in the manufacture of any other article", will both give the same chemical reactions. They are both dissolved by boiling solutions of caustic alkali; both will char when burned leaving a residue and emitting the characteristic odor of burning bone. It is plain that there can be no chemical test to determine how much Lindquist "shoddy" and how much Lindquist "pure wool" is contained in a wool fabric. It is only by a chemical test that the percentages of different materials in a fabric can be determined. So far as this feature is concerned, the Lindquist bill is completely unworkable.

It is evident from the press and individual comments on this bill that the public is under the impression its enactment will enable a purchaser to know how much "shoddy" has been used in the manufacture of wool clothing offered for sale. Not only is this impossible, but Mr. Lindquist knows it to be so. On May 10, 1913, he introduced a so-called "pure textile" bill in the House

(H. R. 4981) which could be fairly interpreted as requiring the proportions of Lindquist "shoddy", and "pure wool" to be stated on the label. Something happened between May 10 and December 8, 1913, to enlighten the gentleman from Michigan, for on the last named date he introduced the



5, Dung Locks,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents per lb. (at left) are Lindquist "pure wool"; 6, Garnetted Worsted Waste, 33 cents per lb. (at right), is Lindquist "shoddy."

bill (H. R. 10,080) which you are now asked to endorse, and which, while retaining the definition of "pure wool" and "shoddy", and providing that fabrics shall be labeled to indicate the percentage of each of these materials, has a new clause hidden at the end of Sec. 16, which reads as follows:

That in all articles or fabrics composed in part

of pure wool and shoddy the percentage of these constituents need not be stated.

On December 18, ten days after the introduction of the revised version of the bill, Mr. Lindquist appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and gave this explanation for the addition of the new clause just quoted:

You will note that my bill differs from all others, as I do not require the percentage of these two constituents when used in the manufacture of the same article. The reason of this is because in testing a garment made from part shoddy and part new wool, the result of the test has the same effect upon each of these constituents, so it would be impossible to determine the exact percentage of each. In such cases the label would state that the article contains a portion of both shoddy and pure wool. This can be ascertained by a microscopical test.

Mr. Lindquist had learned something since May 10, 1913, but on December 18, he still had something to learn. He was as wrong regarding the microscope on December 18, as he was regarding chemistry on May 10. The microscope will reveal the number of serrations in a wool fiber, but that does not provide a standard by which Lindquist "shoddy" can be distinguished from Lindquist "pure wool". Some "shoddy" has more of these serrations than some wool, and some wool has more of them than some shoddy. Neither will the length of the fibers serve as a standard, for, as we have seen, some shoddy is longer than some wool and some wool is longer than some shoddy. There is only one way in which to determine beyond question whether

## INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

8

(H. R. 4981) which could be fairly interpreted as requiring the proportions of Lindquist "shoddy", and "pure wool" to be stated on the label. Something happened between May 10 and December 8, 1913, to enlighten the gentleman from Michigan, for on the last named date he introduced the



5, Dung Locks, 1½ cents per lb. (at left) are Lindquist "pure wool"; 6, Garnetted Worsteds, 33 cents per lb. (at right), is Lindquist "shoddy."

bill (H. R. 10,080) which you are now asked to endorse, and which, while retaining the definition of "pure wool" and "shoddy", and providing that fabrics shall be labeled to indicate the percentage of each of these materials, has a new clause hidden at the end of Sec. 16, which reads as follows:

That in all articles or fabrics composed in part

9

of pure wool and shoddy the percentage of these constituents need not be stated.

On December 18, ten days after the introduction of the revised version of the bill, Mr. Lindquist appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and gave this explanation for the addition of the new clause just quoted:

You will note that my bill differs from all others, as I do not require the percentage of these two constituents when used in the manufacture of the same article. The reason of this is because in testing a garment made from part shoddy and part new wool, the result of the test has the same effect upon each of these constituents, so it would be impossible to determine the exact percentage of each. In such cases the label would state that the article contains a portion of both shoddy and pure wool. This can be ascertained by a microscopical test.

Mr. Lindquist had learned something since May 10, 1913, but on December 18, he still had something to learn. He was as wrong regarding the microscope on December 18, as he was regarding chemistry on May 10. The microscope will reveal the number of serrations in a wool fiber, but that does not provide a standard by which Lindquist "shoddy" can be distinguished from Lindquist "pure wool". Some "shoddy" has more of these serrations than some wool, and some wool has more of them than some shoddy. Neither will the length of the fibers serve as a standard, for, as we have seen, some shoddy is longer than some wool and some wool is longer than some shoddy. There is only one way in which to determine beyond question whether

a wool fabric contains "shoddy", and that is by an actual inspection of the materials before and during the processes of manufacture.

#### ADVISED BY GOVERNMENT BUREAUS

Mr. Lindquist tells the House Committee that shoddy can be distinguished from wool by the microscope, and he gave the Retail Dry Goods Association at New York on February 12 the source of his misinformation:

I am informed by the Bureau of Chemistry in Washington and also by the Bureau of Standards that in all cases where shoddy is used to any damaging extent in the construction of goods, that it can be determined whether shoddy exists, so that such a label would enable the buyer to know whether the article he is purchasing for all wool contains shoddy.

These samples of what Mr. Lindquist calls "shoddy", many of them superior to the samples he would call "pure wool" stamp the quoted opinions of the Bureau of Standards and Bureau of Chemistry as ridiculous. Even more absurd is the qualification, "where shoddy is used to any damaging extent". If it cannot be distinguished in one case, how can it be distinguished in the other? Who is to determine the "damaging extent"? Are we to accept the mere opinion of employes of government bureaus, who have but a superficial and second-hand knowledge of textiles? Are manufacturers and merchants to be fined and imprisoned on the dictum of anyone regarding a matter which in the very na-

ture of things is unknown and unknowable? How does it happen that members of Congress can get such misleading advice from government department? The facts I have stated about wool and shoddy, which you can readily verify and the samples that lie before you prove that the statements of these Bureaus and Mr. Lindquist's assertion that shoddy can be distinguished from new wool when mixed in a fabric are wholly unfounded. Here is the conclusion of one of Germany's leading textile experts, Leo Pinagel, chairman of the Testing Commission for the Textile Industry at Aachen, Germany:

We have found up to the present time no reliable means to determine by specific observation the presence of small quantities of shoddy. Opinions to the contrary, whether private or official, are wholly without foundation. There is only one reliable method to determine whether shoddy has or has not been used in the manufacture of a fabric, namely, the production of the spinners' lot books and the sworn testimony of the persons who made the record.


So far as wool and shoddy are concerned, the Lindquist bill collapses completely. It is not only undesirable but impossible. The only way to make it workable is to provide at enormous expense a vast army of government inspectors to go into the woolen and worsted mills of the country, and watch every stage in the process of manufacture, and another army to watch the partly manufactured products as they move between the thousands of mills and merchants throughout the country. And for what purpose?

That wool goods may be labeled according to Lindquist, to show that they contain or do not contain Lindquist "shoddy", or Lindquist "pure wool", wholly arbitrary definitions that in many cases cast discredit on the superior fiber, and represent the inferior material as the better of the two. Even if that were accomplished by an enormous increase in government expenditures, it would, of course, be wholly inoperative so far as foreign woolens and worsteds are concerned. Importers could with impunity label wool goods as "pure wool", even when made principally from inferior shoddy, like this sample (No. 7), selling for 5 cents a pound, for example, in which the fibers are just long enough to have two ends. The government would be powerless to detect the fraud, whereas American manufacturers who made wool cloth from such superior stock as this worsted waste (No. 2, 57 cents), would be forced to have their goods marketed as Lindquist "shoddy".

THE SAME LABEL ON HIGH AND LOW GRADE  
GOODS

One more illustration of the absurdity of the Lindquist definitions of "shoddy" and "pure wool" and I will turn to other phases of the question. Here is a sample (No. 8) of the highest grade of coat lining that I have been able to find in Boston. It is made with a fine cotton warp and worsted filling, and is composed by weight of 27 per cent. of cotton and 73 per cent. of wool. It is sold by the yard at a price equivalent to \$4.48

per pound. Here, on the other hand, is a sample (No. 9) of the cheapest grade of shoddy goods that I have found, being a product of the famous Batley district of Yorkshire, England. It is made with a cot-



8, Coat Lining, \$4.48 per lb. (at left); 9, Low Grade English Cloth, 24 cents per lb. (at right). Both of these fabrics could bear the same Lindquist label, "27 per cent. cotton, 73 per cent. wool," without the possibility of detecting the violation of the law.

ton warp and rag shoddy and cotton mixed filling. A chemical test shows that it is composed, as is the coat lining, of 27 per cent. of cotton and 73 per cent. of wool fiber. It is sold at the rate of 24 cents per pound.


One is a cloth of the highest grade, costing nearly nineteen times as much as the other, which is one of the cheapest wool fabrics

That wool goods may be labeled according to Lindquist, to show that they contain or do not contain Lindquist "shoddy", or Lindquist "pure wool", wholly arbitrary definitions that in many cases cast discredit on the superior fiber, and represent the inferior material as the better of the two. Even if that were accomplished by an enormous increase in government expenditures, it would, of course, be wholly inoperative so far as foreign woolsens and worsteds are concerned. Importers could with impunity label wool goods as "pure wool", even when made principally from inferior shoddy, like this sample (No. 7), selling for 5 cents a pound, for example, in which the fibers are just long enough to have two ends. The government would be powerless to detect the fraud, whereas American manufacturers who made wool cloth from such superior stock as this worsted waste (No. 2, 57 cents), would be forced to have their goods marketed as Lindquist "shoddy".

## THE SAME LABEL ON HIGH AND LOW GRADE GOODS

One more illustration of the absurdity of the Lindquist definitions of "shoddy" and "pure wool" and I will turn to other phases of the question. Here is a sample (No. 8) of the highest grade of coat lining that I have been able to find in Boston. It is made with a fine cotton warp and worsted filling, and is composed by weight of 27 per cent. of cotton and 73 per cent. of wool. It is sold by the yard at a price equivalent to \$4.48

per pound. Here, on the other hand, is a sample (No. 9) of the cheapest grade of shoddy goods that I have found, being a product of the famous Batley district of Yorkshire, England. It is made with a cot-



8, Coat Lining, \$4.48 per lb. (at left); 9, Low Grade English Cloth, 24 cents per lb. (at right). Both of these fabrics could bear the same Lindquist label, "27 per cent. cotton, 73 per cent. wool," without the possibility of detecting the violation of the law.

ton warp and rag shoddy and cotton mixed filling. A chemical test shows that it is composed, as is the coat lining, of 27 per cent. of cotton and 73 per cent. of wool fiber. It is sold at the rate of 24 cents per pound.

One is a cloth of the highest grade, costing nearly nineteen times as much as the other, which is one of the cheapest wool fabrics

made anywhere in the world. Under the Lindquist bill the high grade cloth (No. 8) would be labeled 27 per cent. of cotton and 73 per cent. of "pure wool", and under the same law an importer could label the low grade fabric exactly the same, and by no test, chemical or microscopical, could misbranding be proved. We have touched but the fringe of the Lindquist "shoddy" absurdities, but in the face of what has been shown, I ask the supporters of this bill what their opinion would be of a man who to secure and retain a position as a Lindquist inspector of fibers would swear to the presence of Lindquist "shoddy" in a fabric and subject a manufacturer or merchant to fine or imprisonment or both under this ridiculous measure.

#### SHODDY A PILLAR OF SOCIETY

The value of wool fibers for clothing purposes depends, not on whether they have or have not been previously used in the manufacture of goods, but upon their length, strength and structure, some "shoddy" as we have seen, being much superior to some wool. It is not generally recognized, nevertheless it is a fact, that what is known as "shoddy" is one of the greatest supports of human life in temperate and cold climates. In March, 1902, twelve years ago, when the Grosvenor "shoddy" bill, the prototype of the Lindquist bill, was pending in the House of Representatives at Washington, I calculated from the best statistics available, how much wool cloth each person would have annually if the

world's entire wool clip was manufactured into cloth without the admixture of shoddy or other materials and the cloth apportioned equally among the people living outside of the tropics. Each person's share would be 13.2 ounces of cloth, equal to a piece of summer weight cloth 44 inches square, the size of this sample (No. 10). The recollection of the recent cold weather in this vicinity with the thermometer from 10° to 20° below zero F. will aid us to appreciate the value of shoddy as a necessity of life in temperate and cold climates.

#### COTTON AND THE LINDQUIST BILL

I want now to consider the Lindquist bill as it relates to other textile materials. Take cotton for example, one of the most important of textile materials, produced in vast quantities at a low price. It is a mistake to consider all cotton as cheap. The most expensive textile material I have found is a high grade of cotton. Here for example is a sample of 400s cotton yarn (No. 11), spun by the Fine Spinners' and Doublers' Association, Manchester, England. A pound of it measures 191 miles and would reach from Boston nearly to New York. As you can see from the spinner's memorandum, the Manchester price of this yarn on November 10, 1913, was £4 10s. (\$22.05) per pound. This is over four times the present price of the highest grade of raw silk yarn quoted on the New York market.

Here are two samples of dress goods now on sale in the same store and within

five minutes' walk of this State House. One of them (No. 12) is a high grade wool challie sold at the rate of \$5.05 per pound; the other (No. 13) is a cotton crepe sold at the rate of \$7.38 per pound, or \$2.33 more per pound than the wool challie. These illustrations show that cotton, while abundant and ordinarily low-priced, yet is capable of being manufactured into very expensive goods. What does the Lindquist bill propose to do to cotton goods. Why, to label them "pure cotton" regardless of intrinsic value, so long as they contain no other material. Under this remarkable bill the high grade cotton crepe (No. 13) sold at \$7.38 per pound, the low grade cotton cloth like this sample (No. 14) now selling in Boston at 23 1/2 cents per pound, and high grade goods made from yarn like this sample (No. 11), which in the form of yarn costs \$22.05 per pound, would all be labeled as Lindquist "pure cotton". How much information would a label of that kind convey to the prospective purchaser of cotton cloth? And yet the petition for this resolution says:

The enactment of this legislation will greatly benefit the people of the United States in a great savings that will be made in the purchase of the necessities of life, such as cotton and woolen clothing, boots and shoes, and in this way contribute towards the reduction in the present high cost of living.

The petitioner may know a lot about boots and shoes, but he must have given a very light touch to his study of wool and cotton or he would not have made any such claim as that.

#### A REAL REMEDY FOR MISREPRESENTATION AND FRAUD

I could continue indefinitely to point out the absurdities and impossibilities of this Lindquist bill, but what has already been said is enough to show that the bill is impracticable and undesirable, and should be relegated to the waste basket.

It is not my purpose merely to oppose the resolution. I want also to propose a substitute for the ridiculous Lindquist bill, a workable substitute that will prevent misrepresentation and fraud in the sale, not only of textiles, but of all other goods in the United States. It is not denied that there are at the present time many abuses in the sale of goods of all kinds. Goods made of wool mixed with cheap silk waste are sold as "all wool", and detection of the fraud is extremely difficult, for both materials are dissolved in boiling solutions of caustic alkali. Goods made of wool and cotton are sometimes sold by dishonest or ignorant dealers as "all wool", and, while the fraud is easily detected, redress for the damage is slow and difficult. Cotton goods may carry an excessive amount of sizing, and be sold as "cotton". Cotton is sold as linen. Artificial silk passes as silk. These and many other methods of misrepresenting textiles should be stopped. Moreover misrepresentation and fraud is not confined to the textiles and boots and shoes named in the Lindquist bill. The evil extends to every commercial product, not only

at retail, but in the wholesale trade as well.

The varied commercial forms of wood, iron, steel, brass, lead, copper, tin, stone, cement, gold, silver, pearls, diamonds, jewelry, coal, bricks, gas, hardware, dyestuffs, chemicals, soap, horses, cattle, dogs, furs, felts, pottery, china, glassware, asphalt, automobiles, wagons, carriages, oils, rubber, leather and textile belting, cordage, ivory, whalebone, blacking, paper, photographic supplies, chairs, tobacco, watches, clocks, cutlery, feathers, fruit, vegetables, food, drugs, glue, gunpowder, hay, straw, ice, water, ink, pianos, paint, varnish, japan, musical instruments, anything and everything we buy; it is necessary only to enumerate them to bring to mind the variegated forms of deceit, misrepresentation and fraud practiced on the buyers, and against which the laws on the statute book now offer no adequate protection. There is a crying need for legislation to protect the purchasing public. Such measures as the Lindquist bill offer no remedy. Even if it were not as ridiculous and unworkable as we have found it to be, it would apply only to a comparatively few articles, to interstate commerce and to trade within the District of Columbia and certain Territories. In intrastate trade where the remedy is needed most it could have but a remote and indirect effect.

#### THE BRITISH MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT

What the public needs is a law that will reach all commercial products, in all commercial transactions, both within and be-

tween the States and Territories. This can be done. I want briefly to state how, and to ask that, if any recommendation is made to Congress, you substitute my plan for the resolution now before you. My suggestion is that you approve the enactment of a general law by Congress forbidding all false description of all goods offered for sale, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, unless the accused can prove that he acted without intent to defraud. For twenty-seven years a law known as the Merchandise Marks Act, based on that principle, has been in force in the United Kingdom, and has proved an effective means of protecting the public. Since its enactment in 1887 it has been reenacted in most if not all of the British Colonies. The following extract from the original act shows the underlying principle of the Act, which I wish to recommend to you:

Every person who applies any false trade description to goods (or causes it to be done) shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, and unless he proves that he acted without intent to defraud, be guilty of an offense against this Act.

Every person guilty of an offense against this act shall be liable—

(1) On conviction on indictment, to imprisonment, with or without hard labor, for a term not exceeding two years, or to fine, or to both imprisonment and fine; and

(2) On summary conviction to imprisonment, with or without hard labor, for a term not exceeding four months, or to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds, and in case of a second or subsequent conviction to imprisonment, with or without hard labor, for a term not exceeding six months, or to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds.

The expression "trade description" means any description, statement, or other indication, direct or indirect.

(a) As to the number, quantity, measure, gauge, or weight of any goods, or

(b) As to the place or country in which any goods were made or produced, or

(c) As to the mode of manufacturing or producing any goods, or

(d) As to the material of which any goods are composed, or

(e) As to any goods being the subject of an existing patent, privilege, or copyright, and the use of any figures, word, or mark which, according to the custom of the trade, is commonly taken to be an indication of any of the above matters, shall be deemed to be a trade description within the meaning of this Act.

It would be necessary to frame a United States law to suit conditions in this country. My suggestion now applies only to the underlying principle of the law, which forbids false description and does not make impossible, impracticable, useless and misleading requirements for the definite marking of merchandise. While my suggestion refers to the principle of the law, I ask you to consider such details as the extension of the law to cover oral, as well as written descriptions of merchandise. Such an Act as I suggest might wisely be followed by supplementary laws covering special cases, such for example as the Massachusetts act of May 18, 1900, forbidding the sale of dress goods containing more than a specified quantity of arsenic, or the law recently enacted in Great Britain regulating the sale of inflammable cotton goods known as "flannelette", which was made necessary by the many cases of injury

and death resulting from "flannelette" clothing catching fire. The weighting of silk has been carried to such an extreme as to be a serious evil. It is for the interest of not only the consumer, but the silk manufacturers as well, to stop the abuse, but up to the present time no reliable method has been found for determining the amount of weighting in silk. For this reason a law which, like the Lindquist bill, requires that silk goods be marked to indicate the amount of weighting would be a dead letter. What is needed is a careful investigation of silk weighting and then if found practicable, the enactment of a special law, regulating the practice. Such laws, however, should be supplementary to the general legislation. Any attempt to reverse the process and deal with special cases first will inevitably result in such grotesque and impossible measures as the one proposed by Congressman Lindquist.

#### STATE AS WELL AS NATIONAL LAWS REQUIRED

I want also to suggest if you make any recommendation to Congress, that it take the form not only of the approval of the principle of the British law, but also a recommendation of a plan of procedure by which the variations and conflict between State and United States laws, which have proved so serious an evil in the case of the pure food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, may be avoided, and the remedy for fraud or misrepresentation may apply to all kinds of goods in both interstate and intrastate com-

merce. This can be accomplished by enacting first, the right kind of a law at Washington, and then by the enactment of corresponding laws by the different States. No bill of this kind passed by Congress can reach the retail trade directly, and the retail trade is where fraud and misrepresentation in the sale of goods take their toll from the pockets of the consumer. The buyers at retail would derive slight benefit from a law that, while protecting the wholesale purchaser in interstate commerce, would leave merchants as free as at present to practice fraud and misrepresentation of goods when dealing them out by retail. By enacting corresponding State laws the protection to the consumers would be as complete as it now is in the United Kingdom. The efficiency of the protection there is well illustrated by the following item from the London Times of January 31, which reports a case under the Merchandise Marks Act:

**Argentine Meat Labelled "Scotch"**

At Guildhall yesterday, before Alderman Sir Marcus Samuel, John Gardner, a meat salesman of the Central Meat Market, with many shops in London, was summoned for selling beef under a false trade description. The complaint was that on December 13 last a piece of beef labelled "Scotch," but which was in fact Argentine chilled beef was sold to an inspector of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. The facts were not in dispute and only one summons was proceeded with.

For the defense Mr. St. John Hutchinson said that there was absolutely no question of fraud. Mr. Gardner and his manager did all they could to see that everything was properly labelled, but in the rush of business a salesman did undoubt-

edly place the "Scotch" label in the wrong place.

Sir Marcus Samuel imposed a fine of £20 (\$100) and costs.

Bills similar to this Lindquist impossibility have been introduced in Congress for years. They have been backed by a variety of interests. The wool growers have been for years and many of them are still deluded by the idea that the price of wool would be raised by a law forbidding its use a second time unless it was marked "shoddy". The people want protection against fraud and misrepresentation, and accordingly Representatives and Senators, ignorant of or indifferent to the fact that the bills would prove useless, injurious and impossible, have played politics and introduced these measures in order to gain votes. Recently another influence has been at work. Politicians have not only known that they can gain votes by advocating these fake bills for "pure textiles" or "pure anything else," but certain alert merchants have discovered that they can increase their sales and profits by the same process. A textile manufacturer or merchant who ventures to expose the absurdities of the Lindquist bill invites the odium of being in favor of fraud, misrepresentation and the adulteration of goods. On the other hand, the manufacturer or merchant who proclaims his support of the measure finds his reputation for honest dealing and the sale of unadulterated goods enhanced to a degree that is in proportion to the publicity given to his support of the impossible and ridiculous bill. In a speech

delivered before the Retail Dry Goods Association in New York on February 12, Congressman Lindquist, the author of the bill, who is himself a clothing manufacturer, is reported to have given in the following words an excellent illustration of the manner in which this species of terrorism on the one hand and fake reputation for "pure goods" on the other are promoted in connection with the agitation for this impossible bill:

The whole purpose of the bill is designed to protect the honest manufacturer, the wholesaler, the retailer and the consumer. Every honest manufacturer should welcome the passage of such a bill, rather than be opposed to it, even though its passage would entail some slight extra expense. It is not an expense that will fall upon the manufacturer, but would ultimately fall upon the consumers of this country, and the consumers of this country would most cheerfully pay for this added protection to them.

I ask this committee to put an end to the farce so far as this State is concerned; to show Congress and the country that the Committee on Federal Relations of the Massachusetts General Court consists in 1914 of men who are not playing cheap politics on a question vitally affecting the welfare of the people; who are ready to defy popular clamor promoted by selfish interests; and who have the intelligence and foresight required for rejecting this petition and framing a substitute that will remedy the evils that now unquestionably exist in the manufacture and sale, not only of textiles, boots and shoes, but of all other merchandise.

**END OF  
TITLE**